Vorwort / Preface

Gianina Iordăchioaia & Elena Soare

Current trends in the study of nominalization

Nominalization has been at the forefront of linguistic research since the early days of generative grammar (Lees 1960, Vendler 1968, Lakoff 1970). The theoretical debate as to how a theory of grammar should be envisaged in order to capture the morphosyntactic and semantic complexity of nominalization, initiated by Chomsky's (1970) *Remarks on nominalization*, is just as lively today, after five decades during which both the empirical scope and the methodology of linguistic research have seen enormous progress. We are delighted to be able to mark this occasion through our collection, next to the anniversary volume *Nominalization: 50 Years on from Chomsky's* Remarks, edited by Artemis Alexiadou and Hagit Borer, soon to appear with Oxford University Press.

This collection represents a selection of the papers presented at the 8th JENom *Workshop on Nominalizations/Journées d'Etude sur les NOMinalisations*, organized at the University of Stuttgart in 2019 and aims to offer insights into the diversity of theoretical and methodological trends that the study of nominalization is currently following. It gathers work on several languages that ranges from addressing new empirical aspects of nominalization to contributing a better understanding of previously known formations, which are now addressed from a different theoretical and/or methodological perspective.

The empirical domain of this collection covers little-documented languages such as Ktunaxa (or Kutenai, an indigenous language isolate spoken in Canada and the USA) and Esahie (a Central Tano language spoken in Ghana), besides more widely-studied languages such as Irish, Italian, Japanese, French, and English. Different types of nominalizations are considered: from syntactically complex patterns (Ogawa, Niikuni & Wada and Gatchalian) to standard suffix-based nominalizations (Varvara and Wauquier, Hathout & Fabre), deverbal compounds (Knittel & Villoing), and zero-derived/conversion nouns (Iordăchioaia, Schweitzer, Svyryda & Buitrago Cabrera, Bloch-Trojnar, and Tribout), or a mixture of segmental and suprasegmental morphology (Broohm & Melloni).

From a theoretical and methodological perspective, the collection is just as broad: It offers synchronic, but also diachronic insights, syntax-oriented and lexicalist approaches, as well as corpus-based and experimental studies,

which contribute new empirical resources or statistical modeling of corpus data, as detailed in the brief summaries below.

Ogawa, Niikuni & Wada combine a diachronic and an experimental approach to a nominalization via juxtaposition strategy in Japanese. As they argue, coordination and juxtaposition of verbs or adjectives can form an NP if the conjuncts are antonymous to each other. This "Nominalization of Antonymous Combination" Construction (NACC), entirely new to the study of Japanese nominalizations, is identifiable by the alternation between Nominative and Genitive subjects and is only visible when considering diachronic data. The authors analyze this construction as a nominalization *via* an empty nominalizer, that is, similar to a zero-derivation, and show that it has been gradually developing in the history of Japanese. On the basis of a survey of the Corpus of Historical Japanese, they show how the various types of the NACC have developed diachronically, and an explanation is proposed along the lines of Ogawa's (2014) hypothesis of "syntactic constructionalization", which makes the right predictions about the differences in acceptability judgments among speakers of different ages with respect to the various types of NACC. These ratings are collected via an acceptability-rating experiment with 400 participants, which confirms the relevance of age in accepting the construction.

Broohm & Melloni investigate the role of tone in action nominalizations in Akan, Gã, Lɛtɛ, and Esahie (i.e. Kwa languages spoken in Ghana). Building on previous studies on word formation in Akan, Gã, and Lɛtɛ, in which tone is shown to accompany various morphological strategies such as suffixation, compounding, and reduplication, Broohm & Melloni argue that tone has a morphological function in some nominalization patterns (especially in Akan and Lɛtɛ), where it is the only indicator of the verb-to-noun transposition, in the absence of other morphology. In Esahie, in particular, they show that a (floating) high tone, in association with the suffix, plays a morphemic role in deverbal nominalization. They conclude that true conversion is not available in action nominals in Kwa languages, since in the absence of overt suffixes, some tonal change will be present to mark the nominalization. Unusual as tonal morphology may look from the perspective of European languages, the presence of suprasegmental morphology reminds us of stress shift in deverbal zero-derived nominals in English, as the authors also remark (cf. the contribution by Iordăchioaia et al. on English).

Gatchalian offers a theoretical study of nominalizations in Ktunaxa, an understudied language spoken in Canada and the USA. He uses data elicited from native speakers from Eastern British Columbia and proposes a typology of deverbal nominalizations in this language. Gatchalian argues that these nominalizations, formed by means of the left-peripheral

nominalizing particle *k*, fall into two classes, according to the level at which the particle attaches. vP-nominalizations (which in other theories may correspond to VoiceP) allow the realization of external arguments, while VP-nominalizations do not. When present, the external argument takes the shape of a possessor showing the same morphology as verbal subjects. The *k*-morpheme present in these nominalizations is analyzed as the head of a category-changing nP, which is able to take various levels of verbal structure as its complement. Besides an application of current theoretical tools to an understudied language, this article presents particularly interesting data, inasmuch as nominalizations are omnipresent in Ktunaxa, and show a complex structure even when they denote entities like *bed* or *pyjamas*.

The studies by Varvara and Wauquier, Hathout & Fabre contribute a computational linguistics perspective on the competition between different deverbal nominalizing suffixes in Italian and French. **Varvara** investigates the productivity domains of the suffixes *-mento* and *-zione* in Italian in order to understand what properties of the base verb play a role in the selection of one suffix over the other. She analyzes the occurrence of 678 nominalizations in a corpus from 1841 to 1947 and thus focuses on the *realized* (and not the *potential*) *productivity* of these suffixes (Baayen 2009). By means of a logistic regression model, she evaluates how the length in characters, the inflectional class, as well as the presence and number of other affixations influence the selection of one suffix over the other. In particular, she finds that *-zione* attaches to verbs of the first conjugation, while *-mento* favors those of the second and third conjugation. Moreover, *-mento* nominals are more likely to appear with morphologically complex verbs and especially those prefixed by *a-*, even though base verbs with greater length in characters tend to form nominalizations with *-zione*. Varvara's conclusion is that productivity constraints do not represent strict rules with binary outcomes but rather emerge as preferences with a graded effect.

Wauquier, Hathout & Fabre examine the degree of technicality in French nominalizations involving the suffixes *-age*, *-ion* and *-ment*, by combining Distributional Semantics and statistical modeling. Although all three suffixes appear to be approximately equivalent in forming action nominalizations, some semantic differences have been pointed out in the linguistic literature, and the authors are investigating their potential to be used as technical terms. After proposing a linguistic definition of technicality, Wauquier, Hathout & Fabre implement empirical, quantitative criteria based on corpora and lexical resources to determine to what extent these can adequately characterize the notion of technicality. Some of these criteria, such as the number of synonyms and definitions of a nominal, prove to be significant in discriminating *-age* as more technical than *-ion* and thus confirm the starting

hypothesis of the study. -*Ion* nominals are shown to be more heterogeneous than those with -*age*, while the results on -*ment* nominals are less clear. The authors highlight the need for additional criteria to evaluate technicality, including manual annotation, which would complement the aspects evaluated in their study.

Iordăchioaia, Schweitzer, Svyryda & Buitrago Cabrera address zero-derived nominals in English, which have received little attention in recent generative literature until Borer (2013). The core of the study is a newly created database of 1,000 English zero-derived nominals (e.g., *to walk > a walk*), which collects data on the semantic classes of their base verbs (e.g., change of state, psychological verbs, verbs of motion, communication, emission) and the different interpretations (event, result state, product, agent) that they may receive. The authors investigate the interpretation patterns of these zero-derived nouns in relation to the semantic type of their base verbs (i.e. result or manner, following Rappaport Hovav & Levin 1998), by also addressing some challenges to previous generalizations made in the literature. While some of these observations are confirmed by the database, zero-derived nominals are shown to also display some unexpected properties such as the relization of event readings with argument structure, which bring them closer to suffix-based nominals than previously assumed.

Bloch-Trojnar offers a syntactic analysis of Irish deverbal nominals from the perspective of Grimshaw's (1990) distinction between Complex Event, Simple Event and Result Nominalizations. On the basis of various empirical tests, she argues that Irish deverbal nominals do not encode complex events with aspectual properties; they may represent simple event nominals (also found in light verb constructions), which show event implications, and result nominals, which are devoid of any verbal properties and resemble lexical nouns. Bloch-Trojnar implements her analysis in Distributed Morphology and argues that simple event nominals incorporate a verbalizing vP, which is missing in result nominals. For the realization of internal arguments in simple event nominals, which lack aspectual structure, she argues in favor of a theory in which argument realization is independent of aspect – such as in Alexiadou's 2017 on Greek synthetic compounds) and against Borer's (2013) approach, in which argument structure is dependent on the projection of aspect.

Knittel & Villoing examine French verb-noun compounds that receive a Means interpretation (*couvre-pied* 'blanket', lit. cover-feet) and are derived from stative bases. These nominals are shown to be ambiguous between a Means and an Instrument reading, which leads the authors to discard previous treatments in terms of verbal homonymy, as put forward in Lexematic Morphology. Instead, Knittel & Villoing adopt the notion of a polysemous lexeme to account for this dual interpretation. They propose a formal account

based on Kratzer (2000) and Rothmayr (2009), by adopting Rothmayr's (2009) hypothesis of bi-eventive verbs. The verbal bases are asumed to have both an agentive (eventive) and a stative component, which accounts for the double Means/Instrument value of the verb-noun compounds under investigation. The distribution of the Instrument vs. Means/Instrument values is shown to rely on the state that the referent of the noun involved in the compound acquires after the occurrence of the event described by the verbal base. If this state is reversible, a double Means/Instrument reading obtains, while a permanent state entails a "pure" Instrument reading.

Tribout addresses what is called, especially in the French lexicalist literature, "nominalization by conversion" in French, also known as zero-derivation, i.e. pairs in which the output and the base of this word formation process have the same form such as in *marcher* 'to walk' – *marche* 'walk'. Tribout discusses the issue of directionality raised by these pairs, which challenge the traditional conception of derivational rules. After summarizing both derivational and non-derivational approaches to conversion, Tribout discusses and dismisses various criteria which have been used to determine directionality: diachronic ones, such as date of first attestation or etymology, as well as synchronic ones, such as semantic relations, noun gender or verb inflection. These criteria are evaluated on a corpus of 3,241 French morphologically complex noun-verb pairs, with a clear directionality. While all criteria may contribute to a decision in particular cases, none of them systematically applies to all noun-verb pairs. Tribout argues that the directionality of conversion in French is not determinable – which, she suggests, is also the case with some suffix-based derivations – and pleads for paradigmatic morphology as an appropriate framework to account for such formations.

The diversity of empirical, theoretical, and methodological contributions in this collection once again demonstrates that, even fifty years after Chomsky's *Remarks*, nominalization remains just as exciting a domain of research. It shows great potential for new hypotheses and ideas either by investigating lesser-studied languages or by applying new methodologies to well-known data. The empirical and theoretical picture that emerges is that of a variety of nominalizing constructions that span the lexical, morphological, and syntactic domains in a gradual continuum both within individual languages and crosslinguistically.

Given the variety of nominalizing constructions and approaches that it comprises, the present volume contributes new perspectives and advances in the field of word formation across languages. It may be of interest to scholars who work on syntax, morphology, lexical semantics, corpus linguistics, statistical modeling, and historical linguistics.

Acknowledgements:

References

Alexiadou, Artemis. 2017. On the complex relationship between deverbal compounds and argument supporting nominals. In Maria Bloch-Trojnar & Anna Malicka-Kleparska (eds.), *Aspect and valency in nominals*, 53–82. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Chomsky, Noam. 1970. Remarks on nominalization. In Roderick Jacobs & Peter Rosenbaum (eds.), *Readings in English Transformational Grammar*, 184–221. Waltham, MA: Ginn.

Baayen, R. Harald. 2009. Corpus linguistics in morphology: Morphological productivity. In Anke Lüdeling & Merjy Kytö (eds.), *Corpus linguistics. An international handbook*. Vol. 2, 899–919. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Borer, Hagit. 2013. *Taking form. Structuring Sense*. Volume III. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Grimshaw, Jane. 1990. *Argument structure*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Kratzer, Angelika. 2000. Building statives. In Lisa Conathan, Jeff Good, Darya Kavitskaya, Alyssa Wulf, & Alan Yu (eds.), *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*. 385–399. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.

Lees, Robert B. 1960. *The grammar of English nominalizations*. The Hague: Mouton.

Lakoff, George. 1970. *Irregularity in syntax*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Ogawa, Yoshiki. 2014. Diachronic demorphologization and constructionalization of compounds from the perspective of distributed morphology and cartography. *Interdisciplinary Information Sciences* 20. 121–161.

Rappaport Hovav, Malka & Beth Levin. 1998. Building verb meanings. In Miriam Butt & Wilhelm Geuder (eds.), *The projection of arguments: Lexical and compositional factors*, 97–134. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Rothmayr, Antonia. 2009. *The structure of stative verbs*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Vendler, Zeno. 1968. *Adjectives and nominalizations*. The Hague: Mouton.

Gianina Iordăchioaia
Universität Stuttgart
Institut für Linguistik: Anglistik
Keplerstraße 17
70174 Stuttgart
gianina@ifla.uni-stuttgart.de

Elena Soare
Université de Paris 8 - UFR Sciences du Langage
UMR 7023 du CNRS
2 rue de la Liberté
93256 Saint Denis
elena.soare@univ-paris8.fr